

JUL 23 2005

The Honorable Jon W. Dudas 9/-6-

III) Petition to revoke the wrong decision for rejection, written in (G11), concerning
Appl. 10/970,742 "Anti-submarining seat-belt assembly"
Docket No.: G6A4

- (G1) My amended application of 03/24/2004, registered on 04/05/2004 by USPTO
- (G2) Mrs Draper's OAS (Office Action Summary) of 06/23/2004
- (G3) My letter of 08/06/2004 incl. the first amended application and drawings, registered on 09/02/2004 (?) by USPTO, to Mrs. Draper
- (G4) Mr. Dunn's first OAS of 02/25/2005
- (G5) My 4-page objection of 04/12/2005, incl. my second amended application, to his OAS (G4) regarding the status and verdict
- (G6) Mr. Dunn's Advisory Action of 04/26/2005; Deadline 10/26/2005
- (G7) My objection, faxed on 05/05, 16 and 17/ 2005, to Monages's invention (G6)
- (G8) My objection, faxed on 05/18/2005, to US 4,402,548
- (G9) Mr. Dunn's amended claims, e-mailed on 05/24/2005, in regard to allowance. See attached.
- (G10) My response of 05/25/2005 to (G9)
- (G11) Mr. Dunn's second OAS of 06/10/2005; Deadline 09/10/2005
- (G12) My response of 06/15/2005 to (G11) and request to mail the US 5,257,854 (Korneliusen) document

Allow me please to list the sequence of references that Mr Dunn cited:

- 1 + 2) Despite having received twice (G3, G5), totally, 20 shortcomings of Monages US 5,524,928 and read them he came to the following verdict on my invention. *"The examiner maintains that the rejections are proper"* (G6). Although he has received additional information regarding the shortcomings (G7) I had to explain him the shortcomings during the phone call on May 16. He did understand the shortcomings when being explained from the first to the sixth ones. Why have he and Mr. Dickson not read those 20 shortcomings before issuing (G6). Should they not issue a Notice of Allowance?
- 3) During the phone call on May 17 he cited another reference US 4,402,548 whose shortcomings I listed in (G8). He came to the conclusion that my appl. is allowable and he will e-mail me his amendments. See his e-mail (G9) attached.
- 4) During another phone call and in (G11) he cited another reference US 5,257,854 which is infeasible, inapplicable and has nothing to do with preventing belt users from submarining! Unfortunately, I could not download the drawings of US 5,257,854 stored at USPTO. Hence, I requested him for mailing it (G12). Reading the content I am able to list the following shortcomings:

Unfortunately, no agencies world-wide give approval to motor vehicles, equipped therewith, thus resulting in bankruptcy of the car corps, due to the following deficiencies, infeasibility and inapplicability:

- F1. Since the introduction of three-point seat belts by Volvo Corp. at first in USA and Sweden in about 1962 a great number of wombs and/or foetuses, when the female belt users are pregnant, should be destroyed because all motor vehicle world-wide are not equipped therewith. The destruction thereof would be reported in newspapers and incur US-law suits, compensatory damages of, totally, over one billion of dollars over four decades and the bankruptcy of all car corps. This is solid evidence for the problem cases, which are fictitious.
- F2. Despite closely working with experts of FAA, NTSB, NHSTA, Canadian Transport, IIHS, EU, Police and Prosecutors I have never read in any court-file or expert-report the destruction thereof in the event of abrupt braking. In such event her inertia force is negligible due to the maximum braking deceleration lower than 10 m²/s. Porsche's ceramic braking

DUDAS 220705a

Dr.-Ing. Grot Djen Go
Pfehlgrabenstr. 45
D-5510 Idstein
Germany

The Honorable Jon W. Dudas 9/-7-

system has a far higher one. In an abrupt braking the belt retractor jams the extending belt portion and body of belt user can *only* be thrown forwards by great kinetic energy while the lap belt portion remains in the same position.

In accidents the shoulder belt portion under load of great belt force fractures not womb, but lung, heart, aorta etc., listed in medical reports while the belt retractor retracts the seat belt by about 30 cm.

For sure, the upward movement of the lap belt portion as well as the principle object don't comply with Technical Mechanics.

F3. Should we, Mechanical Engineers, consult David Copperfield how to move upwards the lap belt portion in the event of abrupt braking. The greatest nonsense is written in US 5,257,854!

F4. According to the principle object of invention that device, being put into operation, prevents the lap belt portion from moving upwards to the womb of the female belt user, particularly when pregnant, in the event of abrupt (rapid) braking, but *not* submarining! The goal thereof has nothing to do with preventing belt users from submarining!

F5. The connector is a metal buckle with open profile, which is broken by large belt force, listed in Table 1 of my 10/970,742. Another connector comprises male and female elements, which are in a releasable snap connection. This has nothing to do with the common plug-in connection of a conventional latch plate with a conventional buckle assembly. In the event of abrupt braking and further travelling the foldable, lightweight seat-cushion, being foldable, is moving around, thus making the pregnant belt user feel uncomfortable and distracting her from the traffic.

F6. In accidents the belt users are forced to move at first in the direction of their respective inertia forces and, within milli-seconds, finally in the direction of their respective kinetic energies. Due to the foldable property the seat-cushion covers are folded. Due to lack of energy absorbers the seat belts, greatly elongating, fail to restrain them, particularly when the belt users are obese. See Chap. D4 of my 10/970,742 regarding great elongation resulting in the ejection of the child out of the Toyota Yaris and the 90 kg-heavy driver of the AUDI A6 freeing himself out of the restraint.

F7. Because the seats of a five-seat car, equipped with seat-cushion covers, are suited for fat women, beautiful, slender film stars must stay at their hotel until the ones with proper size, if available, and the seat cushions are purchased and installed therein. During that time the car stays idle at the hotel parking lot and the film festival goes on without them. Definitely, they sue the car corp.

F8. The principle object of invention discriminates millions of obese women from the normal ones. When taking seats they, wholly covering the respective female elements of connectors, can never use the devices.

F9. The principle object of invention discriminates against millions of women wearing long gown. How can they use the devices?

F10. The principle object of invention discriminates against millions of slim women. Their worms or fetuses are destroyed when they under great force slam into the connectors and lap belts.

F11. An A380 with 600 seats and a five-seat car have to be provided with 3000 and 25 seat-cushion covers and seat cushions for five different sizes of obese, fat, normal-size, slim and slender women. When all male passengers use the seat belts 3000 or 25 cushion covers must be put away and stored. As a result, money, personal and time must be spent on purchasing, administrating, collecting, storing and transporting them.

F12. Ford Corp. has recalled 1.4 million brand-new motor vehicles due to the unreliability of the plug-in connection of latch plate with buckle assembly, both of which are standard parts manufactured by the renown supplier TRW! The seat-cushion cover, releasable snap connection and straps have to undergo lengthy, expensive testing and certification for

DUDAS 220705a

Dr.-Ing. Grot Djen Go
Pfehlgrabenstr. 45 /
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

Please forward my 9-page facsimile to The Honorable Jon W. Dudas



Office of the Chairman

National Transportation Safety Board

Washington, D.C. 20594

FEB - 5 2003

Dr. - Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfahlgrabenstr 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

Dear Dr. Go:

Thank you for your letter of December 25, 2002, regarding the seatbelt that you have designed, which you suggest will provide a more effective passenger restraint system than is currently available in automobiles or aircraft.

The National Transportation Safety Board is an independent Federal agency mandated by the U.S. Congress to investigate transportation accidents, determine the probable cause(s) thereof, and make recommendations to prevent future accidents. The Safety Board is not authorized to endorse or recommend products or to conduct or sponsor research and development activities. Therefore, you may want to contact the following officials at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration:

Mr. Nelson J. Miller, Manager
FAA Technical Center
AAR4
Aircraft Safety Research Branch
Atlantic City Airport, New Jersey 08405

Mr. James Saunders, Room 6226
Applied Research
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
400 Seventh Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20590

Thank you for your interest in transportation safety.

Sincerely,

John Hammerschmidt

John A. Hammerschmidt
Acting Chairman